DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 481 CE 073 693

AUTHOR Condelli, Larry
TITLE Evaluation Systems in the Adult Education Program: The Role of Quality Indicators.
INSTITUTION Pelavin Research Inst., Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Oct 96
NOTE 55p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Adult Education; *Educational Quality; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Influences; Program Evaluation; *Statewide Planning; *Systems Approach
IDENTIFIERS Arkansas; Colorado; Connecticut; Impact Studies; Iowa; Kentucky; *Quality Indicators; South Dakota

ABSTRACT

Implementation of quality indicators in the evaluation of adult education programs of 49 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico was examined. The study focused on development of measures and standards for the indicators and the impact of quality indicators on state accountability systems and program quality. Most states had completed the indicator measures and standards development process, nearly two-thirds had implemented measures of the quality indicators, and approximately half had accompanying performance standards to the measures. An additional 10 states had developed but not yet implemented the measures, and 8 states had developed but not yet implemented performance standards. All states had at least begun developing measures, and all but five states had at least begun developing performance standards. Thirteen states were using the measures/standards in program funding decisions, and 15 additional states planned to do so. State directors of adult education programs in 10 of the 23 states reporting full implementation of the measures and standards uniformly noted the strong positive impact of the measures and standards development process in their states. (An appendix constituting approximately 75% of this document contains information on the use of quality indicators in Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Kentucky, and South Dakota.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 481

EVALUATION SYSTEMS IN THE ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM: THE ROLE OF QUALITY INDICATORS

October 1996

Division of Adult Education and Literacy
Office of Vocational and Adult Education
U.S. Department of Education

Prepared by:
Larry Condelli
Pelavin Research Institute
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE073693

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation Systems in the Adult Education Program: The Role of Quality Indicators 1

Status of State Quality Indicator Measurement Systems 3

Uses of Measures and Standards of Quality Indicators 6

State Implementation of the Indicators 7

Incorporation of the Indicators 10

- Development of Measures and Standards 11
- Impact on State Accountability Systems 11
- Making the Process Work 12

Conclusion: Unique Aspects of the Implementation of Quality Indicator Measures 13

Appendix

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Framework for Developing Quality Indicators, Measures, and Standards: The Example of Retention 2

Figure 2. Number of States Developing and Implementing Measures and Standards of Quality Indicators 6

Figure 3. Number of States by Current of Planned Use of Measures of Quality Indicators 10

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Status of Development of Measures and Standards for Quality Indicators 4

Table 2. Current and Planned Uses of Measures and Standards of Quality Indicators 8

EVALUATION SYSTEMS IN THE ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAM: THE ROLE OF QUALITY INDICATORS

Like other publicly funded programs, adult education has faced increasing demands to demonstrate its effectiveness and the value of the instruction it offers. Over the last several years, amendments to the Adult Education Act, the federal legislation governing the adult education program, have strengthened accountability requirements. The 1988 reauthorization of the Act increased state requirements for local program evaluation by specifying six topic areas that evaluation should address and by mandating the use of standardized test scores in evaluation. The National Literacy Act of 1991 took a further step by requiring states to develop indicators of program quality within two years and to use them in evaluation of their local programs. The indicators were to assess programs' success in recruitment, retention and improving students' literacy skills. The Act also required the Department of Education to develop model indicators of program quality to guide states in the development of the indicators.

Fulfilling its legislative mandate, the Division of Adult Education and Literacy (DAEL) published *Model Indicators of Program Quality for Adult Education Programs* in 1992 that presented eight quality indicators. Besides addressing the three required topic areas, the indicators described elements of quality for program planning, curriculum and instruction, staff development and support services. Within the next year, all states had revised their state plans to incorporate the quality indicators they had developed.

Besides presenting the indicators themselves, DAEL's publication also provided a general framework to guide states' development and use of the indicators. The framework distinguished indicators from measures and performances standards, and related them in a hierarchical, four-step process:

1. ***Select topic areas to focus indicators.*** The National Literacy Act required indicators in recruitment, retention and literacy gains. However, states had the option to add other topics.

2. ***Develop quality indicators in each topic area.*** A quality indicator was defined as a variable that reflects efficient and effective performance of the adult education program.

Since their adoption, the quality indicators have become central to the program evaluation systems of most states. The indicators have helped states define the components of program quality and enabled them to develop measures for evaluating programs to ensure effective practice. This paper presents a summary of state implementation of the quality indicators, focusing on the development of measures and standards for the indicators and the impact they have had on state accountability systems and program quality. The paper also discusses how states are using the quality indicators and presents a summary of the indicator measurement systems in six states.

Status of State Quality Indicator Measurement Systems

The National Literacy Act stipulated only that states develop indicators of program quality in the areas of recruitment, retention and literacy gains. A review of the 1993 amendments to state plans, however, revealed that states developed indicators that were very similar, and in some cases identical, to the broader DAEL model indicators. All states have gone beyond the three required topics and developed indicators in areas of program planning, staff development and curriculum. Most states have also developed indicators of support services and a few states have indicators in such diverse areas as fiscal responsibility and facilities and materials.

States also were required only to develop indicators of program quality – to complete the first two steps of the indicator framework. A review of state activities in this area in early 1996, however, shows that the states have adopted the DAEL framework fully and continued, or are still continuing, the process through the development of measures and performance standards.

Table 1 shows state-by-state results of this review for 49 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico and Figure 2 aggregates the findings across states. A majority of states have completed the indicator measures and standards development process. Almost two-thirds of the states have implemented measures of the quality indicators and about half of the states have accompanying performance standards to these measures. An additional 10 states have developed, but not yet implemented, the measures and 8 states have developed, but not yet implemented performance standards. All states have at least begun the development of measures and all but five states have at least begun the development of performance standards.

Table 1 *(continued)*

Status of Development of Measures and Standards for Quality Indicators

State	Measures			Standards		
	Beginning Efforts	Developed, Not Implemented	Implemented	Beginning Efforts	Developed, Not Implemented	Implemented
AREA III						
Illinois		●		●		
Indiana			●	●		
Iowa			●			●
Kansas			●			●
Michigan			●[1]			●[1]
Minnesota	●					
Missouri			●			●
Nebraska			●			●
North Dakota			●			●
Ohio			●			●
South Dakota			●			●
Wisconsin			●			●
AREA IV						
Alaska			●			●
Arizona			●			●
California		●			●	
Colorado			●			●
Hawaii			●			●
Idaho			●	●		
Montana			●			
Nevada			●			●
New Mexico	●			●		
Oregon			●			●
Utah			●			
Washington			●		●	
Wyoming	●			●		

[1]Measures and standards implemented on a pilot test basis.

NOTE: Blank row indicates the state has not yet begun developing measures or standards.

- ***To identify technical assistance needs.*** States can use measures and standards to identify local programs that need assistance and the areas where assistance is needed.

- ***For program improvement.*** By examining measures and standards for programs overall, the state can assess areas of strength and weakness in their delivery system and target weak areas for improvement. For example, measures could reveal that local programs are not meeting their recruitment targets, signaling the need for state redirection in this area.

Table 2 shows how each state uses or plans to use indicator measures and standards and Figure 3 summarizes uses across states. Perhaps most surprising, 13 states currently use, and an additional 15 states plan to use, the measures and standards in program funding decisions. Local programs in these states could lose all or some of their state funding if they fall below indicator standards. States that use indicator measures in funding decisions give programs one to two years to correct problems identified through the measures and only terminate funding if the program's problems continue past that time. The widespread use of the indicators for funding decisions demonstrates how seriously states have adopted the indicator system as a means of providing quality programming.

As required by legislation, virtually all states use indicator measures to evaluate program effectiveness. Almost all states also use the indicators to promote program improvement and to identify technical assistance needs of local programs.

State Implementation of the Indicators

As with other aspects of the quality indicators, the National Literacy Act leaves implementation of the quality indicators to the states, specifying only that the indicators should be incorporated into states' evaluation systems. The DAEL publication on the indicators also does not address implementation, but allows the states flexibility to use the process in the way that best meets their needs. To gain a more detailed understanding of how states have implemented indicator measures and standards, we contacted 10 of the 23 states that reported that they had fully implemented both measures and standards. The state directors in these states described how the indicators have been incorporated into the state's evaluation system, how the state developed measures and standards, and their impact on state accountability systems. The state directors also offered their opinions on what made the process work in their states.

Table 2 *(continued)*

Current and Planned Uses of Measures and Standards of Quality Indicators

State	Use For:							
	Funding		Program Improvement		Technical Assistance		Program Effectiveness	
	Currently Use	Plan to Use	Currently Use	Plan to Use	Currently Use	Plan to Use	Currently Use	Plan to Use
Minnesota				●		●		●
Missouri	●		●		●		●	
Nebraska			●		●		●	
North Dakota			●		●		●	
Ohio		●	●		●		●	
South Dakota		●	●		●			●
Wisconsin			●			●	●	
AREA IV								
Alaska	●		●		●		●	
Arizona	●		●		●		●	
California								
Colorado	●		●		●		●	
Hawaii			●		●		●	
Idaho	●		●		●		●	
Montana				●		●	●	
Nevada	●		●		●		●	
New Mexico								
Oregon			●		●		●	
Utah			●		●		●	
Washington		●		●		●		●
Wyoming		●		●			●	

NOTE: Blank row or column indicates state will not use, or is undecided about using, measures or standards for this purpose.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Some states also collect indicator measures through a separate report submitted annually by local programs and through the application process. In this latter method, local programs provide the measures in their application for funding and the state evaluates them on how well they meet the corresponding performance standards.

Development of Measures and Standards

The states contacted all developed measures and standards of the indicators in the same way: through the use of working groups and committees established for this purpose. In some states, the committees were subgroups of larger state committees working on broader state accountability and assessment issues. With few exceptions, the indicator committees were interagency, typically including representatives from labor, social service and vocational education agencies, literacy councils and workforce development boards. Some states also included local practitioners and business leaders.

After developing draft measures and standards, the committees typically presented them to local program providers for comment and made revisions based on these comments. Several states then pilot tested the measures in a cross section of local sites before implementing the measures statewide. The usual time from development to implementation of the measures was one to two years.

Impact on State Accountability Systems

State directors uniformly noted that the measures and standards development process had a strong positive impact in their states. The main advantage identified was that the process raised awareness of program quality issues and gave state and local staff the opportunity to define and reach consensus on the characteristics of effective program operation. Measures and standards give direction and focus to program evaluation and provide programs with a way to evaluate themselves and work toward excellence, according to several state directors. By defining how they will be evaluated, the state also has made a statement on what programs should try to accomplish.

Conclusion: Unique Aspects of the Implementation of Quality Indicator Measures

The implementation of indicator measures and standards is not unique to adult education programs. Most federally funded programs now have requirements for using quality measures and standards to demonstrate their effectiveness. For example, the most established and perhaps well known accountability system among federal programs is the performance standards system required by the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Other programs that have formal performance measure requirements include vocational education programs, Food Stamp Employment and Training Programs and Job Opportunity and Basic Skills Programs.

While the existence of formal accountability system is not unusual, the way the adult education quality indicator system has evolved distinguishes it in the following significant ways from similar initiatives.

Voluntary implementation. Unlike the accountability systems of other programs, the implementation and use of measures and standards of quality indicators is not mandated by federal regulation. The only formal requirement is for states to develop indicators and incorporate them into the state's evaluation procedures. On their own, states have adopted DAEL's indicator framework to develop measures and standards and to use them as the basis for a formal system of program accountability.

Focus on program operation and instruction. Many accountability systems measure only participant outcomes. For example, JTPA performance standards assess participant employment, wages and employment retention. While the indicators in adult education also address student outcomes, other indicators address a wide range of program variables, including program planning, quality of curriculum and professional development. These indicators specifically identify elements of quality related to the content and operation of programs. Student outcomes are not ignored – DAEL's model indicators include two indicators of student outcomes and most states have several measures of participant learning and advancement in the program – but adult education's specific focus on program elements in its accountability system is unique. This programmatic focus also goes beyond the legislative requirements for the indicators.

APPENDIX

State Indicator Measurement Procedures:

- Arkansas
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Iowa
- Kentucky
- South Dakota

ARKANSAS

Arkansas incorporates measures and standards of the quality indicators as part of its local program monitoring process. A peer review team visits about one quarter of local programs annually and assesses program performance in program planning, administration, curriculum and facilities, staff development, recruitment, retention and educational gains. The program receives from zero to two points for each performance standard, except for student educational gains standards, where a scale of zero to four is used. After the monitoring visit, the state office sends a letter informing the program on where it stands in each area, and if below standard, areas of improvement needed. Although there is only one formal monitoring visit every four years, each program receives an annual follow-up visit from state staff .

The state uses indicator measures to identify local programs that need technical assistance, to promote program improvement and to demonstrate program effectiveness. The measures are not tied to funding.

Development of the Measures and Standards

A state committee, consisting of state adult education staff, local program practitioners and state literacy council staff, developed the measures and standards for the indicators. Local programs across the state reviewed the initial draft of the measures and state and local staff pilot-tested the monitoring instrument in 26 local programs before it was finalized. After its first year of use, the state further refined the instrument.

Impact on State Accountability System

The indicator measures have improved the overall quality of local programs, according to the state adult education director. Programs now have better planning; improved administration, as measures by the quality of annual statistical information reported to the state; and better coordination with other agencies. State monitoring teams have also noticed improvement in program quality among community-based organization providers and in volunteer programs.

CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES (Continued)

CIF-Measure 7:

Various instructional activities and techniques are used. (III.b., III.c., III.e.)

CIF-Standard 7:

Dated evidence is available that the instructional staff uses a variety of instructional activities and techniques. (Lesson plans, written observations, teacher logs, etc.)

2 points - 2 or more types of documentation
0 points - 1 or no types of documentation

CIF-Measure 8:

Adequate instructional staff is available to meet student needs. (III.a., IV.a.)

CIF-Standard 8:

Dated evidence is available that administrators exercise flexibility in instructional assignments to meet student enrollment loads. (Attendance rosters, schedules, narratives, etc.)

2 points - yes
0 points - no

CIF-Measure 9:

Instruction is adult-oriented. (III.d., III.f., III.g., III.h.)

CIF-Standard 9:

A variety of adult-oriented instructional techniques, materials and supplies are utilized.

2 points - yes
0 points - no

CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES (Continued)

CIF-Measure 13:

The adult education facilities provide a safe and optimum learning environment. (VII.c.)

CIF-Standard 13:

Facilities include appropriate:

a. classroom space for number of students
b. work/study space for staff
c. work/study space for administrators
d. storage for materials and equipment
e. furniture designed for adults
f. equipment and furnishings to meet all program objectives and minimum standards
g. restroom(s) for both men and women
h. safe parking area
i. equipment is installed and functional
j. indoor and outdoor lighting

2 points - all items (a-j) are met
0 points - if any item is not met

EDUCATIONAL GAINS (EG)

Quality Indicator #1: Learners advance in the instructional program or complete program educational requirements that enable them to continue their education or training.

EG-Measure 1:

Students advance to a higher level of skill and/or competency. (IX.a.)

EG-Standard 1: MAXIMUM POINTS

1. The percent of students (unduplicated) with 40 or more hours of attendance who advance. 16

Advancement rates for students enrolled for academic advancement and lifeskills advancement will be examined separately. Further, the advancement rates for students enrolling for academic studies will be determined for students entering on each of the three levels (0-5.9, 6-8.9, and 9-12) because advancement is more difficult for students entering on lower grade level equivalent functioning levels. Scales A, B, and C will be used to examine advancement for students enrolled in an academic course of study. Scale D will be used

EDUCATIONAL GAINS (Continued)

		Points
Scale D (life skill advancement) - may include ESL		N/A
10-15	percent of students enrolled for lifeskills study make documented advancement	01
16-20	percent of students enrolled for lifeskills study make documented advancement	02
21-25	percent of students enrolled for lifeskills study make documented advancement	03
26-30	percent of students enrolled for lifeskills study make documented advancement	04
31 or	more percent of students enrolled for lifeskills study make documented advancement	05

NOTE: N/A's must be subtracted from total possible based on level of students served and kinds of classes taught.

EG-Measure 2:

Students are referred to other programs which will continue to meet their educational needs. (II.d.)

EG-Standard 2:

a. There is dated documentation that information regarding the next level of education is provided to students who complete the highest level of study within a program year. (Referral logs, information packets, referral forms, etc.)

2 points - yes
0 points - no

b. Documentation is available showing that providers who receive students out of their realm of services refer those students appropriately.

2 points - documentation is available
0 points - documentation is not available

STAFF DEVELOPMENT (SD)

Quality Indicator: Program has an ongoing staff development process that considers the specific needs of its staff, offers training in the skills necessary to provide quality instruction, and includes opportunities for systematic practice and follow-up.

SD-Measure 1:

Personnel possess required certification and/or training according to job duties assigned. (IV.a., b.)

SD-Standard 1:

Dated documentation exists that each director/coordinator, counselor, instructor/tutor, and paraprofessional, etc., is trained and certified for his/her position as found in current "Adult Education Policy Manual" and "Qualification Standards for State Positions and Local Positions in Approved Programs" (approved by State Board of Vocational Education July 1990 or newest edition).

2 points - 100%
0 points - less than 100%

SD-Measure 2:

All *new personnel participate in orientation.

SD-Standard 2:

Dated documentation exists that all new personnel have participated in an orientation process. (Calendars, agendas, attendance rosters, etc.)

2 points - yes
0 points - no

SD-Measure 3:

An annual staff development plan is implemented. (IV.b., IX.a., IX.b.)

SD-Standard 3:

a. A dated list of recommendations for an annual staff development plan is implemented based on the following types of data: requests of personnel, examination of progress tests, retention rates, drop-out rates, GED test scores, literacy check-ups, follow-up surveys from community, industry and students. (Annual staff development schedules, agendas, source of needs, etc.)

2 points - recommendations are implemented
0 points - recommendations are not implemented

RECRUITMENT (Continued)

RC-Measure 2:

An ongoing annual recruitment plan has been developed and implemented.

RC-Standard 2:

An annual recruitment plan exists which includes: a monthly calendar reflecting recruitment activities and assigned personnel. Documentation is presented that activities were conducted. (Dated programs, speeches, thank-you letters, evaluation of results of activities, student follow-up logs, etc.)

2 points - plan developed and implemented
0 points - plan not developed nor implemented

RC-Measure 3:

A variety of recruitment techniques are used. (VI.a., VIII.a.)

RC-Standard 3:

Categories and Techniques:

a. Dated Audio Script
   - radio
   - television

b. Dated Print
   - posters
   - flyers
   - newspapers
   - displays
   - inserts

c. Dated Personal Contact
   - letters
   - telephone
   - speakers
   - county fairs

2 points - 1 technique per month for each of the 12 months from 2 or more categories
1 point - 1 technique per month for each of the 12 months from 1 category
0 points - less than 1 technique per month for each of the 12 months

RETENTION (Continued)

RT-Measure 4:

Students accrue between twelve and forty hours of instruction within a program year. (VI.b.)

RT-Standard 4:

Students accrue between twelve and forty hours of instruction within a program year.

2 points - 35 - 50% of all students
1 point - 20 - 34% of all students
0 points - 19% or less of all students

RT-Measure 5:

Students accrue forty or more hours of instruction within a program year. (VI.b.)

RT-Standard 5:

Students accrue forty or more hours of instruction within a program year.

2 points - 30 - 40% of all students
1 point - 20 - 29% of all students
0 points - 19% or less of all students

RT-Measure 6:

Ten percent of absentee students return to the program. (VI.b.)

RT-Standard 6:

Students return to the program after being absent for one monthly reporting period.

2 points - 10% or more
1 point - 5 - 9%
0 points - 0 - 4%

COLORADO

Colorado collects indicator measures in three ways: through its monitoring procedures, on the program application, and through an annual report. Peer review teams use the state's local monitoring instrument, which was recently revised to collect indicator measures, in their annual review of approximately one-third of local programs. The instrument includes measures of educational gains, program planning, curriculum and instruction, staff development, support services, recruitment, retention, administration and facilities. On each performance standard, the program is assessed according to whether it does or does not meet the standard, exceeds the standard, or whether the standard does not exist for the program. Some of the more stable program measures, such as program planning, are also addressed in the program's application for funding. At the end of each program year, local programs submit a report that addresses the student outcome and recruitment measures.

Besides using the indicators for program effectiveness, program improvement and to identify technical assistance needs, the state uses indicator measures in its funding decisions. If a program fails to meet performance standards, it is given a year to improve. If the program fails to improve during that time, it can no longer receive state funds. The main problem programs have had in meeting standards have been in documenting student progress.

Development of the Measures and Standards

A task force of state staff, local program directors and teachers reviewed the indicators and developed draft measures. The program directors and teachers then presented these measures to their programs for comment and the full committee then revised the measures. The task force presented the final measures to all programs at the annual state conference. The development process lasted about 18 months.

Impact on State Accountability System

The main benefit of the indicator measurement system is that local programs are now well versed in program accountability issues. Because of their participation in this process, program

TOPIC: EDUCATIONAL GAINS

Indicator I: Learners demonstrate progress toward attainment of basic skills and life skill competencies that support their educational needs and personal goals.	1	2	3	4	Comments	Methods of Evaluation
1. The program has on file for at least 70% of the students: • initial skill assessments (instrument approved by CDE) • initial need assessments • Student Education Plans (SEP) • documentation of progress within 40 instructional contact hours						
2. The program has measured learner progress through a formal evaluation of at least 50% of the students.						

Additional comments (use back of page if necessary)

TOPIC: PROGRAM PLANNING

Indicator III: Program has a planning process that is ongoing and participatory, guided by evaluation, and based on a written plan that considers community demographics, needs, resources, and economic and technological trends, and is implemented to the fullest extent.	1	2	3	4	Comments	Methods of Evaluation
1. The program has a written plan including: • a mission statement • a long term goal statement • a short term goal statement • a process for recruiting, utilizing and training volunteers						
2. The program has evidence of an annual self-evaluation of the plan conducted by a committee of staff, volunteers, clients, community, etc.						
3. The program has evidence of at least one new reciprocal partnership per year.						
4. The program has evidence of at least one annual proposal submitted for a new funding source.						

Additional comments (use back of page if necessary)

TOPIC: CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION (Continued)

Indicator IV: Program has curriculum and instruction geared to individual student learning styles and levels of student needs.	1	2	3	4	Comments	Methods of Evaluation
4. Based on the student needs as defined in the SEPs, the program's teachers and volunteers: • provide relevant instruction • employ technology-assisted instruction • use a variety of visual aids • emphasize individualized instruction • utilize the resources of the State Literacy Resource Center (SLRC) • pursue instructional improvement through the use of the Area Resource Teacher (ART) network • utilize resources from the local community						
5. The program's teachers and volunteers affirm student progress through: • recording student progress at regular intervals • providing students with information on their progress						

Additional comments (use back of page if necessary)

CONNECTICUT

Connecticut's indicator measures are incorporated into its program monitoring instrument. Local programs first complete the monitoring form themselves, and a multi-agency team then reviews programs annually. The measures in the instrument assess the program in the areas of program planning and operations, recruitment, retention, educational gains, curriculum and instruction, support services and staff development. Some of the educational gains and retention measures – test scores and attendance – are taken from the state's management information system for each program.

The state uses the indicators to demonstrate program effectiveness to other agencies and audiences within the state and for program improvement. If a program falls below standards, the state targets technical assistance to the program in the deficient area. If the program does not make a good faith effort to correct its problems, funding can be reduced or eliminated. Connecticut's two year funding cycle for local programs strengthens the state ability to affect changes.

Development of the Measures and Standards

An interagency committee with representatives from labor, social services, local school districts, the workforce development board, business and state education staff developed the measures and standards for the indicators. A draft of the measures and standards was presented to local programs for comment prior to completion.

Impact on State Accountability System

The indicator measures and standards development process has served the state well by clearly defining the expectations for program quality and systematizing the state's evaluation activities. An added advantage is that local programs are now better prepared to describe their activities and report outcomes to outside agencies. Programs are better prepared for interagency collaboration, which will become increasingly important in the current programmatic environment.

CONNECTICUT INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY

TOPIC	INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY	PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
Program Planning and Operations	• Program has an ongoing planning process which is responsive to the community and participant needs, includes interagency collaboration, and is based on community demographics, resources, and economic and technological trends.	1. The program has an advisory board in place which is widely representative of the community (i.e., business, social service agencies, churches, consumer organizations, students, etc.) and meets on a regularly scheduled basis with a minimum of two meetings a year. *AND* 2. The program has written goals and objectives which are updated and revised, shared with the advisory board and other appropriate agencies, and are reported on an annual basis as to the progress attained.
Recruitment	• Program recruits the population identified within the community as most in need of literacy (i.e., English for the limited English proficient, basic skills and secondary completion programs) and training services through a comprehensive needs assessment.	1. The program, within its goals and objectives, annually establishes a reasonable number of adults to be served and meets or exceeds that recruitment goal. *OR* 2. The program meets or exceeds the average state percentage established for the program year as calculated by dividing the number of adults served by the number in need of literacy services within the state for the preceding program year (ex. FY92 - 10.5% = 54588+520356). *AND* 3. The program has in place a recruitment plan which demonstrates the capability of the program to meet is recruitment goals.

CONNECTICUT INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY

TOPIC	INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY	PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
Educational Gains	• Students demonstrate progress toward the attainment of the basic skills and competencies which support their educational and training needs (continued).	1. Students will demonstrate progress after 75 hours in basic skills or English as a second language (ESL) instruction provided that this amount of instruction occurs over a period of three months (or by the end of the semester - not to exceed four months) in which the student is enrolled in the program by the following: • a scale score gain of at least 3 points in reading or listening on a CAPP Survey Achievement Test or Employability Competency System (ECS) Test; *OR* • a gain of at least 1 grade level on either the TABE or the ABLE; *OR* • progress in acquiring basic skills or English language skills as indicated by students' mastery of a percent of competencies specified for the course. 2. Students will demonstrate progress in high school completion programs over a period of a semester by the following: • GED-pass the GED examination or an increase of at least 5 points on one of the GED practice tests; *OR*

CONNECTICUT INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY

TOPIC	INDICATORS OF PROGRAM QUALITY	PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
Support Services	♦ The program can provide referral to or direct provision of the necessary support services (i.e., counseling, child care, transportation, etc.) for students to remain within their prescribed program.	1. Program will formally collaborate with other agencies to provide the support services necessary to reasonably ensure student completion within the program duration. *AND* 2. Programs will have in place, either internally or through collaboration, a method to assess and evaluate the support service needs of all participants. *AND* 3. Programs will have on file or through collaborative arrangements documentation that the support service needs of participants have been addressed.
Staff Development	♦ The program provides an ongoing professional development process for all staff which incorporates the specific needs of its staff, offers training in the skills necessary to improve teacher effectiveness including the quality of curriculum and instruction, and provides occasions for practice, coaching and follow-up.	1. All professional staff (i.e., instructors, counselors, and administrators) will complete a staff development needs assessment and/or professional development plan which will be updated annually and kept on file. *AND* 2. The program will provide a minimum of two staff development opportunities for all staff. *OR* 3. All professional staff will accumulate, at a minimum, 1.8 continuing education units per year or its equivalent.

IOWA

Iowa translated many of its quality indicators into benchmarks to assess whether the state's 15 community colleges, which provide adult education instruction, are achieving long-range strategic goals. The state established a total of 29 benchmarks in the areas of educational gains, program planning, curriculum and instruction, staff development, support services and recruitment/retention. Each benchmark describes a measure and a target for the year 2000 and a second target for 2005. For example, for educational gains, one benchmark is the "Percentage of adults 18 years and over who have attained a high school or equivalent diploma: 85% for 2000 and 90% for 2005." The state designated 16 of the benchmarks as "core" benchmarks to identify the basic values inherent in the adult basic education program. The benchmarks will be used to guide program policy and priorities, demonstrate program effectiveness and quality and to identify areas needing continued improvement through technical assistance.

The state will obtain the benchmark measures from multiple sources. Student educational gains, for example, will be drawn from the state's management information system. Many of the program measures, such as for the planning process, will come from program monitoring. Broader measures, such as the overall literacy levels in the state, will require the state to conduct research studies to assess progress. The benchmark system has just taken effect in 1996 and will be monitored annually by the state education office.

Development of the Benchmarks

The state used the same committee that developed the quality indicators, measures and standards to develop the benchmarks. The committee, was composed of state education staff and the basic education coordinators of the state's community colleges. Separate subcommittees worked on each benchmark.

Impact on State Accountability System

With its development of benchmarks, the adult education program is at the forefront of the program accountability process in Iowa. The benchmarks clearly communicate to other agencies

Focus Area: 1.0 EDUCATIONAL GAINS

BENCHMARKS

Performance Standard No.	Bench-mark No.	Benchmark Title	Historical	Target Years	
			1995	2000	2005
1.21.1	1	Percentage of adult basic education students whose educational progress will be measured in terms of competency based outcomes.	10%	50%	90%
1.23.1	2	◆ *Core* Percentage of adults 18 years and over who have attained a high school or equivalent diploma.	81%	85%	90%
1.23.2	3	◆ *Core* Percentage of Iowa's GED candidates who pass the General Educational Development (GED) Examinations by Iowa state standards.	92%	95%	97%
1.24.1	4	Percentage of Iowa's GED graduates planning further education/training.	65%	70%	80%
1.24.1	5	Percentage of Iowa's GED graduates who enroll full-time or graduate from post-secondary institutions.	12%	15%	20%
1.31.1	6	Percentage of adults 16 years and over functioning at the five levels of Prose Literacy (understand and analyze text information).			
		A. Level 1	14%	9%	4%
		◆ *Core* B. Level 2	24%	19%	14%
		C. Level 3	37%	42%	46%
		D. Level 4	21%	24%	27%
		E. Level 5	3%	6%	9%
1.31.1	7	Percentage of adults 16 years and over functioning at the five levels of Document Literacy (understand and use graphs, text, maps, etc.).			
		A. Level 1	16%	12%	8%
		◆ *Core* B. Level 2	27%	22%	17%
		C. Level 3	36%	40%	43%
		D. Level 4	19%	22%	25%
		E. Level 5	2%	4%	7%
1.31.1	8	Percentage of adults 16 years and over functioning at the five levels of Quantitative Literacy (understand and apply mathematical concepts).			
		A. Level 1	15%	13%	9%
		◆ *Core* B. Level 2	22%	16%	12%
		C. Level 3	36%	40%	44%
		D. Level 4	23%	26%	29%
		E. Level 5	4%	5%	6%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Focus Area: 3.0 CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

BENCHMARKS

Performance Standard No.	Bench-mark No.	Benchmark Title	Historical	Target Years	
			1995	2000	2005
3.11.1	17	◆*Core* Percentage of Iowa's ABE programs that have a method in place which correlates curriculum/instructional materials with assessed skill levels.	Could not determine from existing databases or current research.	95%	100%
3.11.1	18	Percentage of Iowa's ABE programs that, as evidenced by course outlines, target priority Iowa Adult Basic Skills Survey (IABSS) competencies in concert with basic skills.	Could not determine from existing databases or current research.	90%	100%
3.13.1	19	Percentage of Iowa's ABE programs implementing a procedure for identifying student needs/goals and strategies for attaining these goals.	Could not determine from existing databases or current research.	95%	100%

Focus Area: 5.0 SUPPORT SERVICES

BENCHMARKS

Performance Standard No.	Bench-mark No.	Benchmark Title	Historical	Target Years	
			1995	2000	2005
5.11.1	24	◆*Core* Percentage of linkages that exist between the ABE program and Support Service Agencies.	100%	100%	100%
5.11.2	25	Percentage of State and Local plans specifying Community Resources for Student Support.	100%	100%	100%
5.12.1	26	Percentage of Agencies represented on Participatory Planning Committees.	100%	100%	100%
5.13.1	27	◆*Core* Number of Clients referred to ABE on an annual basis through Welfare Reform.	1775	2000	1850

14

KENTUCKY

Kentucky measures its indicators of program quality in two ways: through a self-evaluation that each local program performs annually and more formally through a program compliance review, conducted annually on one-third of programs by peer review teams. Indicator measures and standards assess educational gains, program planning and evaluation, curriculum, instruction and instructional setting, professional development, support services, recruitment and retention using a three point scale of excellent, satisfactory or needs improvement.

Programs that fall below standards must develop a program improvement plan and are provided technical assistance from state staff to implement the plan. If the program's subsequent improvement is not satisfactory, the program can lose its state funding. The state also uses the measures and standards to identify strengths and weaknesses in the state delivery system.

Development of the Measures and Standards

A committee of practitioners, staff from community organizations, state education staff and state literacy personnel developed Kentucky's indicators measures and standards. The committee first established the indicators and distributed them to local programs. About a year later, the measures and standards were developed and implemented.

Impact on State Accountability System

The quality indicators have given direction and focus to the state and local programs in defining the goals and purposes of the adult education program. The measures and standards have helped the state identify and focus technical assistance activities to programs to improve the statewide system. The local programs can use the indicators as a tool to evaluate themselves and move toward excellence.

Indicators of Program Quality

The Kentucky Department for Adult [illegible] Liter[illegible]
Cabinet for Workforce Dev[illegible]

Quality Indicators

FOCUS: Educational Gains

INDICATOR 1: Learners demonstrate progress toward attainment of basic literacy skills and competencies that support educational needs of adult learners.

The attainment of linguistics, mathematics, communications, and problem-solving competencies are demonstrated by improvement in learners' abilities to speak, read, and write English; perform basic computations; and function more effectively in the workplace and society.

Overall Indicator Rating

Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
1	2	3

Sample Measures

- Attainment of GED or high school diploma
- Standardized test score gains
- Competency-based test score gains
- Teacher/tutor reports of student improvements
- Alternative assessment methods (e.g., student folder assessment, reports of attainment, or improvement in specific employability or life skills)
- Attainment of job, retention of position, and/or advancement in employment

Performance Standards

- All adult learners shall be tested in at least one subject area, with additional testing encouraged as appropriate; however, the lowest test score shall be used to determine functional entry level and program placement. An educational plan shall be developed for each student and shall remain in the student's folder. Educational gains shall be reported after 50 hours of instruction.

Overall Indicator Rating

Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
1	2	3

Sample Measures

- A planning document that addresses the mission statement, and program goals and objectives, shall be reviewed annually to validate congruence between planned program activities and actual activities
- Learner involvement in the program evaluation process
- Flexibility in program location and type, class schedules, skills taught, and services provided
- Documentation of fiscal responsibility
- Community impact through mechanisms such as advisory councils, staff meetings, student questionnaires, interagency networking, and the frequency with which these resources are consulted

Performance Standards

- A council of no fewer than seven members shall meet at least quarterly. Community groups shall be represented (e.g., learners, community agencies, educators, labor, and business and industry). Bylaws and minutes/records shall be maintained for review.
- The following documents shall be available at each program site or central office:
  —annual audit/financial records,
  —annual performance report (generated by the Department for Adult Education and Literacy),
  —staff time sheets,
  —posted hours of operation,
  —records of professional development and training,
  —state and national monitoring/evaluation reports,
  —job descriptions (salaried staff and volunteer staff), and
  —council records.
- Planning documents for the preparation of biennial proposal for federal and/or state funds shall include the following information:
  —up-to-date demographic information;
  —current input from community;

—review of two previous years' performances;
—mission statement;
—goals and objectives;
—resources, tutors/volunteers, staff, materials, equipment, facilities;
—budget; and
—local evaluation plan, including student questionnaire.

FOCUS: Curriculum, Instruction, and Instructional Setting

INDICATOR 4: Curriculum design and instruction address different learning styles and levels of learner needs and abilities.

A variety of instructional approaches shall be used to address the different learning styles and the diverse abilities and backgrounds of students.

Overall Indicator Rating

EXCELLENT	SATISFACTORY	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
1	2	3

Sample Measures

- A variety of current curricula
- Instructional strategies and technological tools to enable all adults to access educational opportunities (e.g., computer-aided instruction, audiovisuals, learning styles inventory [optional], interest inventories, small group instruction, individual instruction)
- Appropriate assessment information that determines learner placement and selection of instructional materials
- Instructional setting adequate to enhance the instructional program
- Progress demonstrated through a comparison of student writing samples (e.g., program entry writing sample compared to subsequent samples)

Performance Standards

- A current list of educational materials will be used to provide appropriate instruction to individual learners. (A minimum of two GED series, two pre-GED series, and two literacy-level textbook series shall be used; additional materials are recommended.)

Sample Measures

- Support services resource/reference guide or list of services available
- Number and type of students referred for support services

Performance Standards

- Resource/reference guide for community services (social and educational) shall be readily accessible to staff and students.
- Documentation of referrals shall be maintained.
- Coordinator or designee shall participate in interagency meetings and shall share information with staff.

FOCUS: Recruitment

INDICATOR 7: Program recruits students in need of adult education services.

The program has an operational recruitment plan that utilizes current needs assessments and local demographic data.

Overall Indicator Rating

Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
1	2	3

Sample Measures

- Types of recruitment activities the program performs
- Recruitment efforts based upon a student-teacher ratio and type of class
- Success recruiting the target population identified in the Adult Education Act

Performance Standards

- A recruitment plan with documentation of activities (e.g., printed materials, graduation programs, newspaper advertisements, follow-up surveys, radio and/or television spots)

- Documented recruitment effort that correlates proportionately to the targeted populations in the community/area served (percentage of targeted populations may be identified using 1990 Census data)

FOCUS: Retention

INDICATOR 8: Learners remain in the program long enough to meet educational goals.

Retention is measured by the learners' successful completion of their educational goals. Attainable retention benchmarks that consider the type of program and learning gains expected for a given number of hours in attendance are established.

Overall Indicator Rating

Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
1	2	3

Sample Measures

- Learners' progress shall include hours in the program, type of program, and progress on Student Educational Plan (SEP)

Performance Standards

- Learners, with the support of instructional staff, shall develop and complete SEPs to meet short- and long-term objectives and goals evidenced by documentation in student folders.

- Learners' progress on the SEPs shall be documented quarterly (not necessarily a standardized test score).

- Learners are encouraged to complete their educational objectives through program retention activities.

- At least 75 percent of all learners entering the program shall complete at least one of the following objectives:
  —remain in the program 50 hours,
  —achieve gain of 0.5 grade level/scale score equivalent on standardized test,
  —obtain a GED,
  —attain the individually-stated educational objective outlined in the SEP, or
  —obtain an unsubsidized job.

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota developed a self-assessment instrument to measure quality indicator measures and standards. All local ABE programs complete the self-assessment annually. The state also conducts an onsite review of a random sample of 20 percent of local programs annually. The self-assessment addresses the indicators for educational gains, program planning, curriculum and instruction, staff development, recruitment and retention. For each performance standard, programs indicate whether they achieved the standard, the plans they have to improve quality, the timeline for making improvements, the person responsible for making the improvements and the technical assistance they will need to achieve their goal.

Programs are not required to address all of the standards, but select the areas where they want to develop their program further. Local programs can then request technical assistance from the state, which may be provided through inservice training, staff development training or visits from the state office. Although currently the state uses the measures and standards as a program improvement and technical assistance tool, funding decisions may be based on program and student progress measures in the future.

Development of the Measures and Standards

A state work group composed of the state adult education director; local practitioners; representatives from labor, vocational education and higher education; and the directors of the state literacy council and lifelong learning council developed the measures and standards, as well as the self assessment instrument. The development process took about a year.

Impact on State Accountability System

The major benefit of the measures and standards is that it allows program staff to select the areas where they want their program to improve. The self assessment instrument then gives them the tool for understanding how to make the improvements. The process also makes programs aware that technical assistance is available and encourages them to view the state office

ABE SELF-ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY INDICATORS INSTRUMENT

Criteria/Standard	Quality Indicator/Measure	Yes/No NA	Plans to Achieve or Improve Quality	Time Line	Person Responsible	Assist Needed
A. Educational Gains **A1** The attainment of linguistic, mathematics, communications, and problem-solving competencies are demonstrated by improvement in learner's ability to speak, read, and write English; perform basic computations; and function more effectively in the workplace and society. (Includes SCANS skills).	Learners, including Literacy and English as a Second Language, demonstrate progress toward attainment of basic literacy skills and competencies that support their educational and personal needs.					
	Level I (0-5.9) Learners attending up to 50 contact hours -- 75 percent will show gain according to indicators on the checklist.					
	Level II (6.0-8.9) Learners attending up to 50 contact hours -- 75 percent will show a grade level gain of one half -year.					
	Level III (9.0-12.9) Learners attending up to 50 contact hours -- 75 percent will show a grade level gain of one year.					

ABE SELF-ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY INDICATORS INSTRUMENT

Criteria/Standard	Quality Indicator/Measure	Yes/No NA	Plans to Achieve or Improve Quality	Time Line	Person Responsible	Assist Needed
A3 Programs promote learner progression into other training or employment opportunities.	Learners advance to training or employment as measured according to (check all that apply) __ Learners referred to other training programs __ Learners entered other training programs __ Learners attained employment __ Learners retained employment __ Learners advanced in employment __ Learners removed from public assistance __ Entered military service __ Other _____					

ABE SELF-ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY INDICATORS INSTRUMENT

Criteria/Standard	Quality Indicator/Measure	Yes/No NA	Plans to Achieve or Improve Quality	Time Line	Person Responsible	Assist Needed
C. Curriculum and Instruction **C1** A variety of instructional approaches are used to address the different learning styles and the diverse abilities and background of learners.	Program has curriculum and instruction geared to individual learning styles and levels of needs as measured according to (check all that apply) __ A variety of current curricula __ Assessment information that determines learner placement and selection of instructional materials __ Existence of learner goal-setting process linked to decisions on instructional materials, approaches, and strategies __ Instructional setting adequate to enhance the instructional program and accessible to individuals with disabilities __ Instructional strategies and technical tools which enhance learners educational opportunities __ Progress demonstrated through a comparison of learner's writing samples __ Other _____					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABE SELF-ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY INDICATORS INSTRUMENT

Criteria/Standard	Quality Indicator/Measure	Yes/No NA	Plans to Achieve or Improve Quality	Time Line	Person Responsible	Assist Needed
E. Support Services **E1** Programs identify support services that affect participation in the program and promote student access to these services by referral to other agencies or direct provision of service. The program has formal or informal coordination linkages with other service providers to facilitate referral (e.g., Labor, Social Services, Human Services, Literacy, Health, BIA, etc.)	Learners have access to a referral process for support services as measured according to (check all that apply) __ Support services resource/reference guide __ List of counseling and peer services available __ Program representative participates in interagency meetings __ Formal interagency agreements __ Informal interagency agreements __ Documentation of agencies receiving referrals __ Documentation of agencies providing referrals __ Documentation of learners referred __ Documentation of follow-up for referrals __ Other _____					